



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The work when completed will consist of five or six volumes. The translator will give us in the last volume the biography of the author, critical notes, and the historical documents that particularly bear upon the subject.

In the prefatory note the translator calls our attention to the fact that he is not giving us a complete translation, and explains that it is because the edition is meant to be popular, so to speak; the translation not being always literal nor always free, but suppressing or abbreviating all those digressions and moralizings of the author, so much in favor with historians of the times, but out of place to-day; and preserving the exact translation of the events and even the literal translation of every passage of literary merit; so that the reader will have a most faithful reproduction of the thought of the chronicler and of the succession of the events that he relates.

In spite of this explanation, it is to be regretted that some other plan was not adopted to obtain the same result. The desire of the scholar who wishes to read the whole of the author, and the desire of the translator to bring into bolder relief the bare facts that are recounted would both have been met by printing in smaller type and in their proper places all those passages that it has been deemed wise to suppress in the interest of definiteness. It should be noted, however, that these suppressions have not been made in any spirit of prudery nor with a desire for ordinary expurgation. It is a pleasure further to say that if we cannot have the whole text and must rely upon some one else to excerpt it for us, there is no one better equipped for the task than the present translator, an expert paleographer, a thorough Latinist, and a trained historian, inspired by an unflinching desire to know the Truth.

JOHN D. FITZ-GERALD.

Columbia University.

POLLAK'S FRANZ GRILLPARZER AND THE AUSTRIAN DRAMA.

Franz Grillparzer and the Austrian Drama by
GUSTAV POLLAK. New York: Dodd, Mead
and Co., 1907. xxi + 440 pages.

Tho Grillparzer has been accessible to high-school and college students for some years in school editions of individual plays, and altho he has been known and admired from the days of Gillies, Lockhart and Byron who welcomed his earlier works warmly, there has been, up to the present, no single English book devoted to the dramatist's whole activity. To introduce Grillparzer to the great English and American reading public is the aim of Mr. Pollak in the present work. In the main, Mr. Pollak has succeeded in giving a clear, readable account of the great Austrian dramatist. Especially welcome are the excellent translations from the plays themselves. These translations, practically the first since Gillies rendered a part of the *Ahnfrau* a few years after its appearance, are done with fidelity and skill and give the general reader, unacquainted with German, a vivid idea of Grillparzer's style and method. They are, perhaps, more successful in the lyric than in the distinctly dramatic passages. The latter are at times stiff and stilted.

But while the book is satisfactory for the general reader, since it is written with intelligence and a real love of the subject, it is disappointing to the student of Grillparzer who misses much that he feels ought to be presented for an adequate survey. After two introductory chapters on Raimund and Anzengruber, the author proceeds to outline as far as possible from Grillparzer's own statements the history of each play and to summarize its action with very free quotation in translation. Beyond this there is nothing but an excellently selected collection of other men's opinions. The book is strikingly lacking in vitality and originality. From the scientific standpoint it can be criticized for lack of a central idea and for too little use of the source material. Such material

as is used is treated with too little critical acumen. It is disappointing that the first American book on Grillparzer should not be a contribution to scholarship or at least should not bring some new points of view to the subject.

The individual chapters vary much in merit. Perhaps that on Ottokar is the fullest and gives, because of the very extensive extracts, the most satisfaction. The chapter on *Der Traum ein Leben* is decidedly the weakest and does not do the play even scant justice. The chapters on Grillparzer's life are pleasantly written and recall all the pathos of the lonely old man fighting against persecution by ignorant censors and bureaucrats, and yet proud and conscious of his own superiority. The chapter on Beethoven will interest the general reader tho its inclusion somewhat disturbs the proportions of the book. The two introductory chapters are also somewhat unfortunate. They lessen the emphasis on the main subject without being in any way a fulfillment of the promise conveyed by the second part of the title. Much more should have been made of Bauernfeld; F. Halm and Collin should have been discussed and Nestroy not have been dismissed with a few indifferent and contemptuous words. In the present day the American public could learn from Nestroy that in a musical comedy, plot, wit and biting, if cynical, satire are not necessarily wanting, and that this type of play can be made the vehicle for real thoughts without the entire prostitution of the intellect of the spectator.

To turn to some of the individual chapters: that on the *Ahnfrau* is sketchy and the treatment of the fate idea is inadequate. The whole basis of the vogue of the so-called fate-tragedy in the times, in the career of Napoleon, cannot be too strongly emphasized. The mention of Zacharias Werner in a book intended to be popular is a mistake unless his really great significance as a pioneer is brought out. A closer examination of the sources would show that the statements in Grillparzer's autobiography need modification when he discusses the origin of the play. Nor is enough made of

the wonderful plot of the drama. The stages of the anagnorisis with its three successive parts, each rising in horror, are well worth a discussion, for they are among the most striking in dramatic literature. Mr. Pollak makes nothing of the element of passion, of the blood taint, the unrestrained play of the emotions, of the mystery of the supernatural element and, finally, of the deep significance of Grillparzer's use of Fate which is ethically so superior to the idea then current.

That the trilogy *Das goldene Vlies* is a drama of the will has escaped Mr. Pollak. This play shows a struggle between the individual will of Medea and the universal will as represented by Greek civilization. To Medea the injustice and cruelty of life are overwhelming, but she stands as the representative of a race, of a culture, which must be swept away to make room for a greater and clearer civilization. The gradual growth of this will and its final dominance of Medea's life with the consequent wreck of her all, are Grillparzer's contribution to the legend. Medea is both tragic and pathetic.

Hardly a better play could have been selected than *König Ottokars Glück und Ende* to show in detail Grillparzer's dramatic method, and Mr. Pollak has given copious extracts from the most interesting scenes. But he has not focussed his points and so the reader is left without a clear idea of the wonderful contrasts and the startling dramatic brilliance of the whole. So for instance, the connection between the three scenes which are decisive in Ottokar's life should be shown. These three, which mark the gradual climax of the tragedy, are the announcement of the election of Rudolf of Hapsburg, with all the dramatic irony of Ottokar's previous arrogance, then the falling of the tent at the malicious blow of Zawisch and, finally, Ottokar's mad plunge into the chapel where his ex-queen, Margaret, lies dead. The intimate connection of Ottokar's wrong to Margaret and his fall are not brought out with sufficient clearness. Mr. Pollak mentions the *Reim-chronik* of Ottokar von Horneck, but does not make enough of Grillparzer's ex-

haustiv historical studies in preparation for the play. Klaar's splendid analysis proves the prime importance of an examination of these sources for the just appreciation of Grillparzer's accuracy and of his power to ennoble as well as to vitalize a dry narrativ. Unless some of these points are made vivid before the average reader's eyes, the play will seem, from Mr. Pollak's discussion, but a curious bit of obscure history and not a live tragedy.

In *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* the conflict between the artificial cloister world and the world of real life, of elemental passions, is not toucht. Then, the slow movement of the fourth act, which has been deemed a fault of construction, should be explained and Grillparzer found to have been justified in thinking this very fourth act one of his best creations. The explanation of the apparent drag of the act is that the whole is intended to show the natural effect of a night of watching upon Hero. If the movement were quicker, the weariness of Hero, the leaden weight of sleep upon her, would not seem so real and her final slumber and the intervention of the priest would not be so well motivated. In this play, too, it should be pointed out that the priest acts from motives of conscience in his destruction of the lovers. He was narrow but lived up to his duty. This conception of the character is a striking evidence of Grillparzer's broad-mindedness, which allowed even to the ultra-conservativ, if honest, the right of opinion and action.

Mr. Pollak is uncertain as to the place of *Der Traum ein Leben* among the dramatist's works. This play is one of the most individual of Grillparzer's plays and its connection with *Medea* has long been clear. Its renunciation of the striving of the world, its inherent pessimism, recall the oft-quoted lines from the end of *Medea*:

"Was ist der Erde Glück—ein Schatten!
Was ist der Erde Ruhm—ein Traum!"

The great art of the play in interweaving the real world with the world of dreams is unnoticed by Mr. Pollak. The character study of

Rustan also deserves more detailed discussion than is given it. The hero of this fairy play with its operatic atmosphere and its sensuous Oriental setting is another Jason, another Ottokar. His words outfly his deeds and his ideals his power of action and his moral force. He is a foreshadowing of the splendid delineation of the Hapsburgs which Grillparzer gives in the drama *Ein Bruderzwist in Hapsburg*.

A discussion of Grillparzer should show far more cogently than Mr. Pollak has done, some of the more constantly recurring of the dramatist's traits. So for example, the persistence of the strong woman contrasted with the weak man. So Sappho, so Medea, so King Alfonso and his strong, cold English wife. Then, the frequency of love, violent and consuming, at first sight, as in the case of Medea and Hero. The keen psychological analyses of race and other types of love, as in Berta and in Zawisch, might be dwelt on with interest. Grillparzer was a master in the skillful portrayal of animal passion in the human sex emotions and so one finds such characters as Rahel, Berta, Otto von Meran and Don Cesar. A chapter might well be devoted to showing how carefully Grillparzer motivated his plots (*Ahnfrau*, *Hero*, *Ottokar*, *Bruderzwist in Hapsburg*) and how minutely he workt out his characters (Jüdin von Toledo, Primislaus, Erny and Bankbanus, Hero, Leon). In these last two points he is unequalled in German literature. He may not have the spontaneous vitality of Goethe, with the consequent touch on every pulse of life, but he has an ability to motivate minutely the intricacies of human passion and to show the intimate workings of the human mind. If he cannot draw the universal meaning from a historical event as does Schiller, he can make history live and historical characters real.

Grillparzer, like Goethe and Schiller, was primarily an artist. He stood aloof from the petty squabbles of the day and echoed but little of the *Zeitgeist* in his dramas. These works are not hostages to the growing realism of the century but are independent, individual works of art, each with its own personality

and each illustrating some great artistic principle. But they are all imbued with glowing human interest; they are never cold and never doctrinaire. Tho Grillparzer, the man, was an Austrian patriot and deeply rooted in his native soil, Grillparzer, the dramatist, with his classic perfection of form, his force and his variety of interest must ever be classt among the first of the universal authors. He followed no models, belonged to no school, was always peculiarly himself and as time goes on and his work becomes known, he must receive the recognition which is his due. It is to be hopt that Mr. Pollak's book, tho lacking in many respects, will serve as an introduction to the great dramatist for the English-speaking public.

GEORGE HENRY DANTON.

Stanford University, Cal.

MEDIÆVAL LATIN FABLES.

Der illustrierte Lateinische Aesop in der Handschrift des Ademar, Codex Vossianus. Lat. Oct. 15. Fol. 195–205. Einleitung und Beschreibung, von DR. GEORG THIELE, Privatdocenten a. d. Universität Marburg. In Phototypischer Reproduktion, mit 5 Abbildungen im Text. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1905. 4to., vi and 68 pp., with 22 plates.

The book here reviewed is one that is epoch making in the history of fable literature, and since the time of Hervieux there has been nothing so important. Unfortunately there are but few copies of it to be found in this country, one of them being in the Library of Congress at Washington. In a letter to Dr. G. C. Keidel of the Johns Hopkins University, written in December, 1906, Dr. Thiele announced that he intended to publish a critical edition of the *Æsopus Latinus* in the summer of 1907, but there has been as yet no notice of its having actually appeared in print. We may, however, look forward to it with great expectations, for together with his present con-

tribution to the subject it will doubtless revolutionize our views of the oldest Romulus collection. In the present volume, Dr. Thiele is concerned chiefly with the Ademar collection of fables.

The energy of the author in the writing of this monograph is truly remarkable, as he draws upon a wide range of evidence from archæological, linguistic, and architectural sources, besides other fields. His argument in brief is as follows:

The investigations hitherto made and starting with Phædrus and Romulus have never sufficiently determined Ademar's relation to them both. The text of the latter's work was published by Joh. Friedr. Nilant in 1709, whose uncle had discovered the manuscript containing it in the library of the University of Leiden. This Ademar collection of fables is accordingly called the Anonymus Nilantinus and it was most severely ridiculed by Lessing, because a poor Romulus text accompanied the edition and prejudiced him against it. Since the year 1709 no one had collated the Ademar manuscript, not even Hervieux. Thus the discovery had never been made that the edition of Nilant was incomplete, omitting both the arithmetical riddles and the illustrations. Dr. Thiele undertakes to give the correct text, to reproduce the illustrations that accompany it, and to prove that, in the main Ademar is Romulus, and in part Phædrus prosed.

Ademar's collection is very important in the history of fable literature, as it is the sole source for twelve of the Phædrus fables and for seven of the Romulus fables. It is, therefore, indispensable for a reconstruction of the Romulus *Æsop*. The illustrations deserve great attention, since we can point to an older, probably Greek *Æsop*, as the source of the Romulus collection and then demonstrate that the old *Æsop* illustrations as well have been transmitted to us.

Dr. Thiele traces the history of the difficulties found in placing Ademar in the fable scheme. Hervieux made no methodical attempt to determine his position, and is scored severely. The best work has been done by Zander, who, however, starts out from wrong premises, in that he excludes from consideration all fables that do not come from Phædrus, but deduces all that do agree, even if only in part, from Phædrus paraphrases. Dr. Thiele objects very strongly to the